



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cen

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/849,261	05/20/2004	Yin-Shang Zteng	MR3287-15	7407
4586	7590	12/26/2006		
ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE			EXAMINER	
3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101			AU, SCOTT D	
ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21043				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/26/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/849,261

Applicant(s)

ZTENG, YIN-SHANG

Examiner

Scott Au

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 May 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to applicant's response to an Amendment, which is filed October 12, 2006.

An amendment to the claims 1-8 have been entered and made of record in the Application of Ztang for a "Household digital automation control system" filed May 20, 2004.

Claims 1-8 are pending.

Note: On the first action "Non final", Examiner missed examining claim 8. Therefore, this action is "Non final" again.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the 31 and 32 as described in the specification in a way that can be understood for examining. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and

where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Referring to claim 1, nowhere in the specification describe the limitation that "the controller is connected with both a fire line a load line with the both ends". As being

supported by paragraph 23, it is not understood the significant of the terms "fire line and load line". Further explanation is required. This limitation contains new subject matter.

Referring to claim 1, nowhere in the specification describe the limitation "infrared-sensitive on/off switch". This limitation contains new subject matter.

Referring to claim 1, nowhere in the specification describe the limitation "relay for converting RF signals emitted from said infrared-sensitive on/off switch into differently coded RF signal". This limitation contains new subject matter.

Regarding claims 2-8 are rejected because the claims are dependent upon claim 1.

Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: "for an user to know" should be changed to "for a user to know". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato (US# 6,636,157).

Referring to claims 1-3, Sato discloses a digital household automation control system, a transmitter unit (RD) (i.e. remote commander) transmitting RF signals; a relay unit (10) (i.e. central controller) for receiving RF signals emitted from the transmitter unit (RD) (i.e. remote commander) and wherein the relay unit transmits the infrared signal to the electronic appliance (2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8) (i.e. home electronic appliances) based on the signal compared (col. 6 lines 22-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US# 6,636,157) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Van der Meulen (US# 6,900,617).

Referring to claim 4, Sato discloses the system of claim 1. However, Sato did not explicitly disclose wherein said input a computer.

In the same field of endeavor of home appliance network system, Van der Meulen discloses the input is a computer (col. 1 lines 35-47).

One ordinary skill in the art understands that the input is a computer of Van der Meulen is desirable in the home electronic appliance system of Sato because Sato teaches the remote control (RD) controlling difference appliances through the central controller (10) (col. 6 lines 22-40) and Van der Meulen teaches the central control station can be a home computer in order for the user to preprogram light or appliances are on or off at different times (col. 1 lines 35-47).

Referring to claim 5, Sato in view of Van der Meulen disclose the system of claim 4, Sato teaches the remote control (RD) controlling difference appliances through the central controller (10) (col. 6 lines 22-40) and Van der Meulen teaches the central control station can be a home computer (col. 1 lines 35-47). Therefore, it is conventional in the art that Sato in view of Van der Meulen disclose wherein said computer is linked into a network adapter for controlling said relay unit via the network.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US# 6,636,157) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Moutaux et al. (US# 6,906,635).

Referring to claim 6, Sato in view of Hayes et al. disclose the system of claim 1. However, Sato did not explicitly disclose wherein said input is a mobile communication unit, for controlling the relay unit.

In the same field of endeavor of electronic appliance system, Moutaux et al. teach the input is a mobile communication unit (col. 1 line 60 to col. 2 line 3).

One ordinary skill in the art understands that the input is a mobile communication unit of Moutaux et al. is desirable in the home electronic appliance system of Sato because Sato teaches the remote control (RD) controlling different appliances through the central controller (10) (col. 6 lines 22-40) and Moutaux et al. teach the remote control unit (6) is a mobile telephone for controlling different home electronic appliances (col. 6 line 65 to col. 7 line 6).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US# 6,636,157) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US# 6,583,723).

Referring to claim 7, Sato in view of Hayes et al. disclose the system of claim 1. However, Sato did not explicitly disclose wherein said input detecting actuator, comprising: a detecting unit initiated by a triggering signal resulting from environmental changes; a central processing unit for processing said triggering signal from detecting unit; and a transmitting unit for emitting the signals emitted from said central processing unit and thereby controlling said relay device.

In the same field of endeavor of home electronic appliance system, Watanabe et al. disclose wherein said input detecting actuator, comprising: a detecting unit initiated by a triggering signal resulting from environmental changes; a central processing unit for processing said triggering signal from detecting unit; and a transmitting unit for emitting the signals emitted from said central processing unit and thereby controlling said relay device (col. 1 lines 6-25 and col. 13 lines 42-50).

One ordinary skill in the art understands that the environment changes sensor of Watanabe et al. is desirable in the home appliance system of Sato because both Sato and Watanabe et al. disclose for controlling home electronic appliances and Watanabe et al. teach the sensor 41 for sensing the environmental chance in order to carry out a desire command.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US# 6,636,157) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Meyer (US# 6,882,334).

Referring to claim 8, Sato discloses the system of claim 1. However, Sato did not explicitly disclose wherein said input is attached with an RF receiving unit, and said controller is built with an RF signal transmitting unit said controller sending a feedback message to said RF receiving unit of said input after adjusting or making an on-off under the control of said RF signal for a user to know the working status of said controller.

In the same field of endeavor of electronic system, Meyer teaches wherein said input is attached with an RF receiving unit, and said controller is built with an RF signal transmitting unit said controller (16) (i.e. computer) sending a feedback message to said RF receiving unit of said input (40) after adjusting or making an on-off under the control of said RF signal for a user to know the working status of said controller (col. 3 lines 47-67 and col. 2 lines 57-67).

One ordinary skill in the art understands that the computer (16) transmits a response back to the wireless keyboard (40) confirming the reception and content of the information of Meyer is desirable in the electronic communication system of Sato because Sato and Meyer both teach the communication of two electronic devices and Meyer further teach the receiver device provides a feedback to the transmitter device once is received the signal.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications form the examiner should be directed to Scott Au whose telephone number is (571) 272-3063. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30AM – 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached at (571) 272-2981. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)-272-1817.

Art Unit: 2612

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-3050.

Scott Au

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'SA' with a stylized flourish.A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JH' with a large loop and a horizontal line extending to the right.

JEFFERY HOFSAAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600